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Two distinguished authors, of the name Dhanañjaya, are well known in Sanskrit literature. One is the author of the Daśarūpaka¹ and the other, the author of the Dvisandhāna-kāvyā (DS), also called Rāghavapāṇḍavīya (RP).² Traditionally, the latter is also the author of two more works, one a Sanskrit lexicon, Nāmamāla or Dhanañjaya-nighantu,³ and the second, a hymn in Sanskrit, Viṣāpahāra-stotra,⁴ in praise of the Jīna, possibly Rāshabha. Lately a good deal of fresh evidence has come to light; and it is necessary to take stock of the evidence regarding the DS and the age of Dhanañjaya. This, the present article attempts to do.

Dhanañjaya and his DS have attracted the attention of eminent Sanskrit scholars since almost the nineties of the last century. K. B. Pathak, while editing the Terdāl Inscription,⁵ added a casual note that Śrutakīrti Traividyā, mentioned in that record, is identical with Śrutakīrti Traividyadeva referred to by Pampa according to whom he was the author of RP in the gata-pratyaṅgata style. He identified Dhanañjaya with Śrutakīrti and assigned him to c. 1123 A. D. He repeated this view rather elaborately in a subsequent paper also.⁶ R. G. Bhandarkar noticed two Mss. of DS.⁷ Accepting Dhanañjaya as the author of the Nāmamāla as well, he pointed out that DS is quoted in Vardhamāna’s Gaṇaratanamahodaya (A. D. 1141). Presuming that the RP of Kaviṅjāja was possibly imitated by Dhanañjaya, he put both of them between A. D. 996–1141, Dhanañjaya being considerably younger than Kaviṅjāja. E. V. Vira


ṭ०३
Raghavacharya\(^8\) reached the conclusion that Dhanañjaya, the author of the \textit{Nāmamālā} and DS, flourished about 750 to 800 A.D., later than Kavirāja whom he assigns to 650–725 A.D. A. Venkatasubbia| studiously refuted K. B. Pathak and reached the following conclusions.\(^9\) This Dhanañjaya is identical with Hemasena (c. 985) mentioned in the Śravaṇa Belgol Inscription No. 54 (67) where he is called Vidyā-Dhanañjaya. In his opinion, it is not unlikely that this Hemasena is the author of the \textit{RP} or the \textit{DS–Kāvyā}, and that it was written some time during A.D. 916–1000. He puts Kavirāja and his \textit{RP} somewhere between A.D. 1236–1307, as against Pathak who assigned him to A.D. 1182–97. Most of the histories of Sanskrit literature have quietly adopted this date for Dhanañjaya.

Among the three works attributed to Dhanañjaya, the \textit{Viśāpathāra-stotra} is a devotional hymn in praise of Jina, presumably Vṛṣabha, in 40 Sanskrit verses (39 \textit{Upajāti} and the last \textit{Puṣpitāgrā}). It is composed in lucid language with catching concepts. The last verse mentions the name of the author by śleṣa:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
किरति विहिता यथामययिनी–\\
विजेन विनताय मनीषितानि भक्ति: ।\\
लवि नुतित्रियया पुनाित्रिषोपादः\\
दिरति सुखानि यशो धनं जयं च \|४०\| ।
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

A Sanskrit commentary on it is available in the Jaina Maṭha at Moodabidri (S. Kanara).

The hymn gets its title possibly from the first word in verse No. 14; and a legend has come to be associated with this hymn that a recitation of it is an antidote against poison. Some of the ideas from it, which are quite traditional in their spirit, as noted by Pt. Premi,\(^{10}\) seem to have been adopted by Jinasena in his \textit{Ādivāpa} and by Somadeva in his \textit{Yaṣastilaka}.

The \textit{Nāmamālā}, also called, in some of its manuscripts, \textit{Dhanañjaya-nīghavat}, is a Sanskrit lexicon of synonyms. There is also an \textit{Anekārthanāmamālā} attributed to him. The following verses occur at the end of his \textit{Nāmamālā}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
प्रमाणमकल्पृयुप्यार्थतया लक्षणम् \| \\
\textbf{II.} संधानकवे: काल्य रत्नायमलिचमयम् \| \textbf{२०१} \| \\
\textbf{व्यक्तेश्चान्यस्येव सक्रियां शिलयमेण:} \| \\
\textbf{मूँगाण्यनामनावीले श्लोकानां हि शत्रुतम्} \| \textbf{२०२} \| 
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\(^8\) \textit{Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society}, (Rajahmundry), 2. ii (1927) 181–84.

\(^9\) \textit{JBBRAS} (New Series 3, i-ii (1927) 134 f.
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In some manuscripts the following two verses are found added after, perhaps, No. 201, Pramāṇam etc.:

 जाते जगति वामीकी शब्द कविरितिः क्रूतस् ।
 कवी इति ततो व्यासे कव्यरूपति दान्तिन ॥
 कल्यं: कत्यरूपति बहुत्रं: दूरमण्डलम् ।
 विनिर्भृत्व विराजितत् कलः जाते धनवजये ॥

It is interesting to note that the first verse, with the third pāda slightly different (Vyāsa jāte kavi ceti), is attributed to Kālidāsa by Jalhaṇa in his Sāktimuktavali. It could not have been composed by Kālidāsa, because it contains a reference to Daṇḍin.

Dhanaṇḍaya, as noted above, ranks his poetic abilities with those of Akalaṅka in Pramāṇaśāstra and of Pūjyapāda in grammar: a veritable triad of gems, two of them their outstanding predecessors. These verses leave, no doubt, that the author of the DS and of the Nāmamālā is one and the same. It seems quite natural that a poet with a thorough mastery over the ocean of Sanskrit vocabulary could easily compose a dvisandhāna poem.

Dhanaṇḍaya does not give any auto-biographical details. Nemicandra, in his commentary on the DS, 118–146 states that Dhanaṇḍaya was the son of Vāsudeva and Srīdevi and pupil of Daśaratha.

It is necessary to put together references to Dhanaṇḍaya and his works so that some broad limits can be put to his date. Dhanaṇḍaya and his works have received sufficient praise; and his poem was so distinguished that he came to be called Dvisandhāna-kavi. The term dvisandhāna seems to be as old as Daṇḍin (c. 7th century A. D.); and Bhūja’s observations quoted below clearly indicate that Daṇḍin also, like Dhanaṇḍaya, had a Dvisandhāna-prabandha to his credit, though it has not come down to us. Possibly, it was Daṇḍin’s third work besides the Kāvyādāraśa and the Daśakumāraraacarita.

11. See the paper of Vira Raghavacharya mentioned above.
12. Edn., GOS, No. 82, Baroda, 1938, p. 45.
13. Nemicandra’s commentary is included in the Jñānapitha edition which would be published soon.

Bhoja (middle of the 11th century A. D.), while discussing the Ubhayālāṅkāra, gives the valuable information that Daṇḍin wrote a Dvīsandhāna–prabandha on the storties of the Rāmāyaṇa and Bhārata. Cf.,

पूर्वीयस्य यथा द्रिशनो धनजयस्य वा दिसन्धानप्रबंधको रामायणमहाभारतावतैतुवचनाति (?)

For our purpose what is significant is that Bhoja mentions Dhanañjaya and his DS along with Daṇḍin and his DS–Prabhandha.

Prabhācandra (11th century A. D.) refers in his Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa to the DS thus:15

नन्तु व्यक्तराङ्गायमात्सालोन्नितकमदकान्यायार्थप्रतिपत्तिं तदविक्षेपित्तिकादविक्यार्थार्थप्रतिपत्तिं प्रथितं प्रदर्शनकालाधिकारिता। तत् केदारप्रतिपत्तिवाचलिन्दनियमनिर्दिष्टथिता। विक्रियायोजनायमात्सालार्थप्रतिपत्तिमिथ्यायम्। लोकसाहित्यदानमान्तन्त्रयकार्यकथास्तित्वार्थपरिवर्त्याव्याप्तिः। व्याख्यातिधार्मिका नियमविविधतावर्ते। न च भक्तराङ्गार्थकला व्यामस्तेयम्यन्तकार्यकृतत्वसंस्कृताधिकारिता।

Vādirāja, in his Paśvanāthacarita,16 composed in A. D. 1025, refers to Dhanañjaya and his skill in more than one sandhāna:

अनेककेसितसन्धानां। खनलो हदरखुडः।।
बाणा धनजयोमुक्ता। कर्ण्येव प्रिया कथम।। १.२६ ||

Durgasimha (c. 1025 A. D.), the author of the Kannada Pañcatantra,17 refers to the RP of Dhanañjaya in these words:

अनुसरकर्तिवशं जीपनेन राजवांडवीयम पेल्लुः। यशो–
अनिधारिवर्णां धनजय वाचान्यां। केवलेन || ३ ||

Dr. B. S. Kulkarni, Dharwar, informs me that the palm-leaf manuscript of the Pañcatantra from Arrah does not contain all those verses referring to the earlier poets.

Scholars are divided in their opinions whether there was only one Nāgavarmā or there were two at different times (A. D. c. 1090 and c. 1145), with some or the other works assigned to them. We get the following verse in his Chandombudhi,18 a work in Kannāḍa on metrics:

17. Mysore, 1898.
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Jātanjaya haripatram trutamārṇa tārāntarāntiṃ–
ṛta mahāṃ śirishāntra yadā sukaproṣṭaṁ čandroeśvāntād– ।

Tā śirośuṣṭaṁ gurudvāra nāvāntaraṁ caivaiva nātī bhā–
rañatāṅaṅaṁ jayajayajayajayajayajayajayajayajayajayajayajayajaya ॥

Dhanañjaya is mentioned here among earlier poets. Narsimhacharya thinks that this is a reference to the author of DS, but A. Venkatasubbiah opines that the author of the Dasarūpaka is intended.

Jalhaṇa (c. 1257 A.D.) in his Sāktimuktāvali19 puts in the mouth of Rājaśekhara (c. 900 A.D.), the following verse about Dhanañjaya:

Dr:sthāne niyogam ś tāṁ caṅkore dhanagnay: ।
Yayā jānte phāt tasya śṛtan caṅkore jay: ॥ ७ ॥

This splitting of the name of the author into dhanam and jaya is quite in tune with what the author himself has done in his works.

As already pointed out by Dr. H. L. Jain,20 Virasena quotes a verse useful for explaining the term iti, and it is the same as No. 39 of the Nāmamālā of Dhanañjaya.

The above references enable us to fix the limits for the age of Dhanañjaya. He must have flourished between Akalaṇka (7th–8th century A.D.) and Virasena who completed his Dhavalā in A.D. 816. Dhanañjaya may, therefore, be assigned to c. 800. In any case, he could not be later than Bhoja (11th century A.D.) who specifically mentions him and his DS.

The DS of Dhanañjaya has 18 cantos, comprising of 1105 verses composed in various metrical forms, his favourite forms being Upajāti, Vasantatiśakā, Sālinī, Svāgatā etc. The benedictory verses in the beginning remembers (Muni-) Suvrata or Nemi, and then Sarasvatī. The story of both Rāma and the Pāṇḍavas is covered in this work, usually taking recourse to śleṣa (double entendre). It is a characteristic so usual with Digambara Jain authors that the tale is said to be narrated by Gautama to King Śrenika. The author lays more stress on dignified descriptions than on the narration of events. Most of the verses are embellished with figures of speech, and they are duly noted by the commentator. In the last canto (especially, verse No. 43 onwards) the author has illustrated many of the Sabdālaṅkāras, a trait common with Bhāravi, Māgha and other poets. The verse No. 143 is an illustration of sarva-gata-pratyāgata.

Presuming that the colophons found at the end of the cantos (but not at the end of cantos 1, 2, 16 and 18) belong to the author himself, it is clear that he gives himself the name Dhanañjaya, or Kavi, or Dvisandhāna-kavi and calls his poem Dvisaṅdhāna

-kāvyya, or the Rāghava-Pāṇḍaviya—(a second name, apara-nāma) Mahākāvyya. At the close of every canto, in the last verse, he mentions his name Dhanañjaya by śleṣa, as in the Viṣṇupahāra-stotra; this is already imitated by Rājaśekhara in the verse put in his mouth by Jalhaṇa.

The title Dvisandhāna indicates the pattern of composition in which each verse is susceptible to two interpretations, and the appellation Rāghava-Pāṇḍaviya connotes the contents of the poem viz., that it deals with the tales of Rāma and the Pāṇḍavas simultaneously. The cycle of tales connected with these two are so much an inseparable part of Indian cultural heritage that any poet who wants to pick up two topics at one and the same time, would easily turn to them, especially because independent epics dealing with them and giving plenty of details and contexts for alternative selection and presentation are available in large numbers. The title Rāghava-Pāṇḍaviya is sufficiently popular. Beside Dhanañjaya, it has been chosen by poets like Kavirāja, Śrutakīrti etc.; and there are also similar titles, e.g., Raghava-Yāḍaviya, Rāghava-Pāṇḍava, Yāḍaviya, etc. With Dhanañjaya, however, the primary title for his kāvyya is Dvisandhāna; and and he, after Daṇḍin, seems to be the pioneer of this type; the Rāgdava-Pāṇḍaviya is only a secondary title.

It is interesting to compare the poems of Dhanañjaya and Kavirāja. Dhanañjaya’s kāvyya has an alternative name RP which is the sole title of Kavirāja’s poem. Dhanañjaya has eighteen cantos with 1105 verses, while Kavirāja has thirteen with 664 verses. Dhanañjaya mentions his own name by śleṣa (thus marking his kāvyya ‘Dhanañjayānka’), while Kavirāja mentions the name of his patron Kāmadeva in the last verse of each canto; in fact the latter’s poem is ‘Kāmadevānka’. A detailed comparison of the contents of these two poems is a desideratum. On a cursory reading one feels that there is not much striking similarity between them. Dhanañjaya has more of descriptions, while Kavirāja narrates the details of his tale successfully inspite of the handicap of śleṣa (see l. 54, 69, etc.). So far as śleṣa is concerned, Kavirāja shows more skill and mastery over vocabulary. Dhanañjaya’s poem is complimented as a ‘monument of poetic excellence’: undoubtedly, he shows a good deal of learning, especially of the nitiśāstra; and some of his arthāntaranyāsas are really profound and striking. As contrasted with Kavirāja’s style, which is lucid and delightful, (cf. 2.11–13), Dhanañjaya writes rather heavy Sanskrit which often needs some effort to understand. In his descriptions, there are very few verses of double entendre which are the normal feature of Kavirāja’s composition. As far as we have seen, there is very little between these two poems as to suggest that one is an imitation of the other.

There is one more poet, Śrutakīrti Travidya, who wrote a Rāghava-Pāṇḍaviya-kāvyya of the gatapratyāgata pattern, a matter of curiosity and wonder among the

21. Edn. N. S. Press, Bombay, 1897, with the commentary of Saśadhara, Kāvyamālā, No. 62.
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learned, as mentioned by Nāgacandra or Abhinava Pampa in his Rāmacandra-carita-Purāṇa, in Kannada, also known as Pampa-Rāmāyaṇa (1.24–25):

आँचल कादिकाव्याक्रणातुल्य विद्वेष्ना मृत्वे वि-
वात्त्वभमानपुर प्रवाहदिशायनीभवाः ||

देवान्त्र कड़लदिदिज़ कहारेन स्याथ्याकविानारैः
तैविब्रह्मार्न्ति विविव्युनिग्रोहि विष्यालयोऽताविन्ते ||२४||

श्रुतकीटिब्रविविधः
वर्ति रापक्षाणान्त समुच्चतमः
कलित्विनिसि गल्पाया-
गलर्विवेंद्रस्मात्सिनं प्रकटितसिद् ||२५||

These two verses are quoted in an inscription at Śravaṇa Beḷgolō No. 40 (64), of A. D. 1163. This Śrutakirti Traividya is mentioned in the Terdāl inscription of 1123 A. D.

तदु प्रवाहदिशायनां सुधर्मी ||

श्रुतकीटिब्रविविधः पदस्तर्कश्चक्रास्तुर परवासऽमितिवभावासी-
पवन्त्र विज्ञ्यरेष्वेपगड़रस्तूतरस्तोः ||

King Goṅka sent for Māghanandī Saidhāntika (the preceptor of Nimba Sāmanta) of Kollagiri or Kolhapur, and the latter’s colleagues were Kanakanandī Panḍitadeva and Śrutakirti Traividya. In another inscription of A. D. 1135, from Kolhapur, Śrutakirti Traividya is referred to as the Acārya of the Rūpanārāyaṇa Basadi of Kolhapur:

शक्तर्कर्षिण सासिदद्व्यालोणेत्र राक्षसस्पर्कस्तु
कातिलविवहुज्ञमि सोमवारंदु श्रीमुखांशदीयगणनालक
पुक्तक गच्छदुर कोल्लापुरः श्रीस्मानारायणस्यविवारः
श्रीश्रुतकीटिविद्वारेष्वेपगड़रस्तूत्वाऽस्य काले कर्मि etc.

Nāgacandra calls him a vrati and so also the Terdāl inscription; i. e., he was a vratin in 1123, but by 1135 A. D. he had reached the status of an Acārya. Expert opinion puts Nāgacandra near about A. D. 1100. This means that Śrutakirti’s age ranges from c. 1100 to 1150 A. D., approximately. So far no manuscript of his RP has come to light.

K. B. Pathak was the first to postulate the identity of Dhanañjaya and Śrutakirti from the latter’s having composed the Rāghavapāṇḍaviya. Rightly enough, R. G. Bhandarkar hesitated to accept this identity. But somehow the date proposed for Dhanañjaya based on this identity attained currency.

22. A Ms. is being used, but the text is available in printed form.
Dhanañjaya and his *DS* or *RP* have to be distinguished from Śrutakirti and his *RP*. First, Dhanañjaya was a householder, while Śrutakirti, a *vratin* and later an Ācārya. Secondly, neither Dhanañjaya nor the sources which mention Śrutakirti give any evidence to suppose that the two names stand for the same poet. Thirdly, a verse from Dhanañjaya's *Nāmamālā* is quoted by Viāsena (A. D. 816); and his *DS*, specifically mentioning the name Dhanañjaya, is referred to by Bhoja (c. 1010–62 A. D.), while the period of Śrutakirti ranges from 1100 to 1150 A. D. Lastly, if the *DS* of Dhanañjaya is already famous to be ranked with the work of Daṇḍin and to be referred to by Bhoja (middle of the 11th century), it cannot be the same work as that of Śrutakirti who was an Ācārya in 1135 A. D. So this identification has no basis; and therefore, the date, based on this identity proposed for Dhanañjaya, namely 1123–40 A. D., has to be given up.

E. V. Vira Raghavacharya’s suggestion of the date for Dhanañjaya (c. 750–800) is nearer the point, but it is not known why he puts Kaviṛāja earlier than Dhanañjaya when Kaviṛāja specifically refers to Muṇja of Dhārā (973–95 A. D.).

Prof. Venkatasubbiah’s thesis, *viz.*, that Dhanañjaya, the author of *DS*, is identical with Hemasena because the later is mentioned as Vidyā–Dhanañjaya in the *Śravaṇa Belgoḷ* Inscription, cannot be accepted. Vādirāja is mentioning in his poem earlier authors and teachers and not necessarily his pontifical predecessors. That Dhanañjaya therefore, was a pontifical predecessor of Vādirāja and identical with Hemasana is not justified. First, Dhanañjaya was a householder. He has not at all mentioned his ascetic line, nor does he speak about his ascetic predecessors; he cannot, therefore, be a pontifical predecessor of Vādirāja. Secondly, nowhere in his works, has Dhanañjaya given his name as Hemasena. Lastly, it is very doubtful whether Vidyā–Dhanañjaya is a proper name, for it could be read as well *vidyā dhanaṁ jaya-padaṁ viśadāṁ dadhāno*. It is also possible that Dhanañjaya here means Arjuna; so Hemasena is Vidyā–Dhanañjaya. If at all Vidyā–Dhanañjaya is a proper name, then, it means that it only distinguishes Hemasena from some other Dhanañjaya who flourished earlier.